

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiesa: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.         | FILING DATE                          | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/596,465              | 06/14/2006                           | Koichi Shimamura     | VPM-02001           | 6948             |  |
| 54004<br>MUIRHEAD       | 7590 06/08/201<br>AND SATURNELLI, I. | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |  |
| 200 FRIBERG PARKWAY     |                                      |                      | ZHU, BO HUI ALVIN   |                  |  |
| SUITE 1001<br>WESTBOROL | JGH, MA 01581                        |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
|                         |                                      |                      | 2465                |                  |  |
|                         |                                      |                      |                     |                  |  |
|                         |                                      |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |  |
|                         |                                      |                      | 06/08/2010          | PAPER            |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)     |  |  |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/596,465      | SHIMAMURA ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit         |  |  |
| BO HUI A. ZHU   | 2465             |  |  |

|  | BO HUI A. ZHU  | 2465  |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the o  | correspondence add  | ress                                     |
| THE REPLY FILED 19 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI   | ICATION IN CONDITION FOR A   | LLOWANCE.   |  |
| <ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on<br/>application, applicant must limely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe<br/>for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C<br/>periods:</li> </ol>  | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi<br>al (with appeal fee) in compliance         | t, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or          | hich places the<br>(3) a Request         |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date   | of the final rejection.  |   |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac<br>no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la<br>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (t<br>MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 766.07(f  | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE<br>).    | g date of the final rejection<br>FIRST REPLY WAS FILE     | n.<br>LED WITHIN TWO                     |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date<br>have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the st<br>set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later<br>may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).<br>NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount<br>nortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl<br>filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten<br>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with<br>AMENDMENTS  | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                    |  |
|  | at arias to the data of films a brief  |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further con</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> <li>They are not deemed to place the application in bett</li> </ol>   | sideration and/or search (see NOT  | TE below);  |  |
| appeal; and/or   |  |   | ie issues ioi                            |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c<br>NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   | orresponding number of finally reje  | ected claims.   |  |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all  | 112 2nd paragraph rejections of cla  | aims 4-7 and 9-19.  |  |
| non-allowable claim(s).  | owable if submitted in a separate,   | aniely nieu amenumer                                      | it canceling the                         |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:   |  | l be entered and an ex                                    | xplanation of                            |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |   |  |
| <ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>   |  |   |  |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>  | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea<br>and was not earlier presented. Se   | al and/or appellant fails<br>se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)        | s to provide a                           |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br/>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>   | of the status of the claims after er   | ntry is below or attache                                  | BG.                                      |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br/>See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>  | does NOT place the application in  | condition for allowand                                    | ce because:                              |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (I  | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).  |   |  |
| /Jayanti K. Patel/<br>Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2465   |  |   |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicants arguments have been fully considered but hey are not persuasive

Applicants argue that Miller's mapping of different fields between the CPIM and XMPP systems is not a conversion process because there is no adjusting the actual content of the fields (Remarks, page 14). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner maintains that when sending messages from XMPP to CPIM, the conversions of the fields of the messages is a conversion process because there is a change in the fields of the messages.

Applicants further argue that Boyer does not disclose the use of the converted presence information that synchronizes the prsence information of the given user between the first system and the second system (Remarks, page 16). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Miller teaches synchronizing of the presence information of a user in the first system and the second system. And Boyer teaches the second presence information is compatible with the other of the first system and the second system.